

THOMAS J. KARR (D.C. Bar No. 426340)  
Email: KarrT@sec.gov  
KAREN J. SHIMP (D.C. Bar No. 456265)  
Email: ShimpK@sec.gov

Attorneys for *Amicus Curiae*  
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION  
Office of the General Counsel  
Securities and Exchange Commission  
100 F Street NE  
Washington, DC 20549-9612  
Telephone: (202) 551-5163 (Karr)  
Facsimile: (202) 772-9263

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

## SANFORD S. WADLER.

**Plaintiff,**

VS.

BIO-RAD LABORATORIES, INC., a  
Delaware Corporation; NORMAN  
SCHWARTZ; LOUIS DRAPEAU;  
ALICE N. SCHWARTZ; ALBERT J.  
HILLMAN; DEBORAH L. NEFF

#### Defendants.

No. 3:15-cv-2356 JCS

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION  
BY THE SECURITIES AND  
EXCHANGE COMMISSION TO FILE  
*AMICUS CURIAE* BRIEF IN  
SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF**

Hearing Date: September 4, 2015

Time: 9:30 A.M.

Place: Courtroom G, 15th Floor

Judge: The Honorable Joseph C. Spero

1                   **MOTION TO FILE AMICUS BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF**

2                   The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC or Commission), a non-party to  
 3 this action, will move the Court, located at the Phillip Burton Federal Building, 450  
 4 Golden Gate Avenue, Fifteenth Floor, Courtroom G, San Francisco, California, 94102,  
 5 on Friday, September 4, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., for an order permitting it to file an amicus  
 6 curiae brief in support of plaintiff Sanford S. Wadler.<sup>1</sup> The brief, a copy of which is  
 7 attached at Exhibit A, addresses an important question concerning the proper  
 8 interpretation of Section 21F(h)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. §  
 9 78u-6. The SEC has consulted with counsel for each party, and neither party opposes the  
 10 SEC's motion.<sup>2</sup>

11                  In their pending motion to dismiss, defendants contend that Wadler's Section  
 12 21F(h)(1) whistleblower employment retaliation claim fails as a matter of law  
 13 because, in its view, the provision protects *only* individuals who have reported a  
 14 potential securities law violation directly to the Commission before the alleged  
 15 retaliation. As explained below, the Commission, through notice-and-comment  
 16 rulemaking and an interpretive release, has adopted a broader reading of the scope of  
 17 Section 21F(h)(1)'s protections.

18                  **I. BACKGROUND**

19                  Section 21F, which was added by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and  
 20 Consumer Protection Act, Pub. L. No. 111-203, 124 Stat. 1376 (2010), provides a

21                  22                  1 The federal government may file an *amicus* brief without consent of the parties or  
 leave of the court on appeal (FED. R. APP. P. 29(a)). There is no corresponding  
 23 provision for filing as *amicus* in a district court, but district courts in this Circuit have  
 24 previously permitted *amicus* participation by non-parties where appropriate. *See, e.g.*,  
*In re Network Assocs., Inc., Sec. Litig.*, 76 F. Supp. 2d. 1017, 1026, 1032 (N.D. Cal.  
 25 1999) ( appending SEC's *amicus* brief submitted upon Court's invitation).

26                  27                  2 Neither the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure nor this Court's Local Rules establish  
 a time period for filing an *amicus* brief. If the Commission were seeking permission  
 28 to intervene—since one of the defendants' defenses is based on a statute administered  
 by the SEC and regulations issued under that statute—then its motion would simply  
 have to be "timely." FED. R. CIV. P. 24(b)(2).

1 number of measures to encourage individuals to step forward to disclose potential  
 2 securities law violations. In particular, Section 21F authorizes the Commission to  
 3 pay monetary awards to individuals who voluntarily provide information that leads  
 4 to a successful enforcement action, and prohibits employers from retaliating against  
 5 individuals in the terms and conditions of their employment when the individuals  
 6 engage in certain specified whistleblowing activities (collectively referred to as the  
 7 “whistleblower program”).

8 When the Commission issued its rules under Section 21F to implement the  
 9 whistleblower program, it included a rule clarifying that the employment retaliation  
 10 protections apply whenever an employee engages in any of the whistleblowing  
 11 activities specified in Section 21F(h)(1)—including making a report of a potential  
 12 securities law violation to a supervisor or compliance official at a public company—  
 13 *irrespective of whether the employee separately reports the information directly to*  
 14 *the Commission. See 17 C.F.R. § 240.21F-2(b)(1).* The Commission issued the  
 15 clarifying rule to address a statutory ambiguity that exists as a result of considerable  
 16 tension within the text of Section 21F.

17 Since the Commission issued its rule, a majority of the federal courts that  
 18 have considered the interpretive issue have agreed with the Commission that the  
 19 statutory language is ambiguous, and have deferred to the Commission’s  
 20 interpretation.<sup>3</sup>

---

21 3 *See Somers v. Digital Realty Trust, Inc.*, Case No. C-14-5180, 2015 WL 2354807, at  
 22 \*3-13 (N.D. Cal. May 15, 2015). *See also Nollner v. S. Baptist Convention, Inc.*, 852  
 23 F. Supp. 2d 986, 993-95 (M.D. Tenn. 2012); *Bussing v. COR Clearing, LLC*, 20 F.  
 24 Supp. 3d 719, 728-35 (D. Neb. 2014); *Rosenblum v. Thomson Reuters (Mkts.) LLC*,  
 25 984 F. Supp. 2d 141, 146-48 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 25, 2013); *Ellington v. Giacoumakis*, 977  
 26 F. Supp. 2d 42, 44-46 (D. Mass. 2013); *Genberg v. Porter*, 935 F. Supp. 2d 1094,  
 27 1106-07 (D. Colo. 2013), *appeal dismissed in relevant part*, 566 Fed. App’x 719 (10th  
 28 Cir. 2014); *Yang v. Navigators Grp., Inc.*, 18 F. Supp. 3d 519, 531-34 (S.D.N.Y.  
 2014); *Kramer v. Trans-Lux Corp.*, 2012 WL 4444820, at \*3-5 (D. Conn. Sept. 25,  
 2012); *Connolly v. Remkes*, 2014 WL 5473144, at \*4-6 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 28, 2014);  
*Khazin v. TD Ameritrade Holding Corp.*, 2014 WL 940703, at \*3-6 (D.N.J. Mar. 11,  
 2014), *aff’d on other grounds*, 773 F.3d 488 (3rd Cir. 2014); *Murray v. UBS*

1           **II. ARGUMENT**

2           The Commission has a strong programmatic interest in demonstrating that its  
 3 reasonable interpretation of Section 21F(h)'s ambiguous statutory language was a  
 4 valid exercise of its broad rulemaking authority.<sup>4</sup> This interest arises for two related  
 5 reasons. *First*, the rule helps protect individuals who choose to report potential  
 6 violations internally in the first instance (*i.e.*, before reporting to the Commission),  
 7 and thus is an important component of the overall design of the  
 8 Commission's whistleblower program. *Second*, if the rule were invalidated, the  
 9 Commission's authority to pursue enforcement actions against employers that  
 10 retaliate against individuals who report internally would be substantially weakened.

11           The Commission respectfully submits that, as the primary federal securities  
 12 regulator and the agency charged with administering the Congressionally-mandated  
 13 whistleblower program, its explanation of the regulatory background and its analysis  
 14 of the statutory text will aid the Court in ruling on defendants' Motion to Dismiss.  
 15 Among other things, the brief thoroughly explains: (i) the importance of internal  
 16 reporting as a means for deterring, detecting, and stopping unlawful conduct that  
 17 may harm investors; (ii) the context and purposes for which Section 21F was  
 18 enacted; and (iii) the Commission's reasonable exercise of its authority to issue rules  
 19 and regulations implementing Section 21F(h) to resolve a statutory ambiguity  
 20 inherent in that section.

21           *Sec., LLC*, 2013 WL 2190084, at \*2-7 (S.D.N.Y. May 21, 2013); *Egan v.*  
 22 *TradingScreen, Inc.*, 2011 WL 1672066, at \*3-5 (S.D.N.Y. May 4, 2011);  
 23 *Peters v. Lifelock Inc.*, CV-14-00576-PHX-ROS (D. Ariz. Sept. 19, 2014), Dkt. #  
 24 47, Order, at 6-13 (attached hereto as Ex. D). *But see, e.g., Banko v. Apple Inc.*, 20 F.  
 25 Supp. 3d 749, 756 (N.D. Cal. 2013) (holding that "the statute is not ambiguous").

26           4 The Commission does not take a position on any other issues that may be presented  
 27 in defendants' motion to dismiss or in this action. The motion to file as *amicus* is  
 28 limited to the issue of whether an employee is required to make a report to the  
 Commission before the alleged retaliation in order to pursue a claim under Section  
 21F(h)(1) and the regulations thereunder.

1           **III. REQUEST TO WAIVE FEDERAL AND LOCAL RULES OF CIVIL  
2           PROCEDURE REGARDING FORMAT AND LENGTH OF FILINGS**

3           The *amicus* brief the Commission proposes to file was initially filed with the  
4           Second Circuit in *Berman v. Neo@Ogilvy LLC*, Case No. 14-4626, and conforms to  
5           that court's length, spacing, typeface, and other rules.<sup>5</sup> The SEC intends to make the  
6           identical legal arguments here as were made in the attached brief. Therefore, to the  
7           extent the brief does not conform to this Court's requirements, the SEC respectfully  
8           requests that the Court exercise its authority to waive these requirements and permit  
9           the brief to be filed in the identical format as attached to this motion. The SEC also  
10          asks that, if the Court does not grant this request, it be granted leave to revise the  
11          brief to conform to this Court's rules.

12          The Commission also respectfully requests that the Court permit it to file  
13          two letters that it submitted to the Second Circuit under FED. R. APP. P. 28(j) to  
14          advise that Court of supplemental authority. In the first letter (dated June 26, 2015,  
15          and attached hereto as Exhibit B), the SEC submitted to the Second Circuit as  
16          supplementary authority the Supreme Court's recent decision in *King v. Burwell*,  
17          No. 14-114, 2015 WL 2473448 (S. Ct. June 25, 2015) (holding that challenged  
18          statutory language in the Affordable Care Act could not be viewed in isolation but  
19          must be read in light of the context and structure of the whole Act). In the second  
20          letter (dated August 5, 2015, and attached hereto as Exhibit C), the SEC advised the  
21          Court of the release that the SEC issued on August 4, 2015, entitled *Interpretation*  
22          *of the SEC's Whistleblower Rules Under Section 21F of the Securities Exchange Act*  
23          *of 1934*, Exchange Act Release No. 34-75592, 2015 WL 4624264, at \*1 (S.E.C. Aug.  
24          4, 2015) (forthcoming in Federal Register) (issuing an interpretive rule "to clarify  
25          that, for purposes of the employment retaliation protections provided by Section 21F  
26          of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ('Exchange Act'), an individual's status as a

---

27          5 The Commission was given permission to file a brief that exceeded the standard  
28          length of an appellate *amicus* brief. As filed, the brief has 8,660 words, excluding the  
parts exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(7)(B)(iii).

1 whistleblower does not depend on adherence to the reporting procedures specified in  
2 Exchange Act Rule 21F-9(a), but is determined solely by the terms of Exchange Act  
3 Rule 21F-2(b)(1)”).

4 **IV. CONCLUSION**

5 For the foregoing reasons, the SEC respectfully requests that this Court: (1)  
6 permit the Commission to file an *amicus curiae* brief in support of the plaintiff; (2)  
7 waive the rules regarding format and length of filings; and (3) accept the attached  
8 brief (Ex. A) for filing, along with the attached Rule 28(j) letters (Exhibits B and C)  
9 to the Second Circuit concerning *King v. Burwell* and the Commission’s interpretive  
10 release.

11  
12 August 7, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

13  
14 /s/ Thomas J. Karr

15 THOMAS J. KARR\* (D.C. Bar No. 426340)  
16 Assistant General Counsel  
17 Attorney for Amicus Curiae  
18 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE  
19 COMMISSION

20  
21 Of counsel:

22 KAREN J. SHIMP\*  
23 Special Trial Counsel  
24 DC Bar # 456265

25 Office of the General Counsel  
26 Securities and Exchange Commission  
27 100 F Street NE  
28 Washington, DC 20549-9612  
Tel: (202) 551-5007 (Shimp)

\* Mr. Karr and Ms. Shimp appear under Civil L.R. 11-2.